

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-6 and 8-29 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 10, 20, and 29 being independent. Claim 7 was previously canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 9-11, 13, 14, 20, and 29 are amended herein. Support for the claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-6 and 8-19 stand objected to because of informalities. Claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 14 are amended herein to address the informalities noted in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the claim objections.

§ 112 SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 20-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as allegedly being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the application, Applicant herein amends claims 1 and 20. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection.

§ 101 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the application, Applicant herein amends claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Dependent claims 2-6, 8, and 9 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6 and 8-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,725,279 (Richter) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,878,431 (Potterveld) and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0004631 (Debique). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 1, as presently presented, recites, among other things, “accessing a highest priority time source as a main presentation clock to which all clock-aware components synchronize” and “facilitating the seamless presentation of media by pre-rolling, the pre-rolling comprising receiving data from the first media source node at the first media sink node before starting a presentation clock synchronized with the main presentation clock.”

Richter is directed to a multimedia processing system and discloses multimedia processing blocks. However, Richter fails to disclose or suggest “accessing a highest

priority time source as a main presentation clock to which all clock-aware components synchronize” and “facilitating the seamless presentation of media by pre-rolling, the pre-rolling comprising receiving data from the first media source node at the first media sink node before starting a presentation clock synchronized with the main presentation clock,” as presently recited in independent claim 1.

Potterveld is directed to a method for providing topology based enterprise management services and was cited for its alleged teaching of “retrieving a cached media pipeline topology” (Office Action, page 8). However, Potterveld fails to remedy the deficiencies in Richter noted above with respect to claim 1. For example, Potterveld fails to disclose or suggest “accessing a highest priority time source as a main presentation clock to which all clock-aware components synchronize” and “facilitating the seamless presentation of media by pre-rolling, the pre-rolling comprising receiving data from the first media source node at the first media sink node before starting a presentation clock synchronized with the main presentation clock,” as presently recited in claim 1.

Debique is directed to an application programming interface for utilizing multimedia data and was cited for its alleged teaching of “facilitating the seamless presentation of media when receiving data from the first media source node by starting a presentation clock after receiving data at the first media sink node” (Office Action, page 10). However, also Debique fails to remedy the deficiencies in Richter noted above with respect to claim 1. For example, Debique fails to disclose or suggest “accessing a highest priority time source as a main presentation clock to which all clock-aware components synchronize” and “facilitating the seamless presentation of media by pre-rolling, the pre-rolling comprising receiving data from the first media source node at the first media sink

node before starting a presentation clock synchronized with the main presentation clock,” as presently recited in claim 1.

Thus, Richter, Potterveld, and Debique, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, independent claim 1 is allowable.

Dependent claims 2-6, 8, and 9 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite.

Independent claim 10, was rejected for similar reasons as independent claim 1, and is allowable for reasons similar to those given above. Richter, Potterveld, and Debique, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or suggest “a time source as a main presentation clock to which all clock-aware components synchronize” and a topology loader configured to “synchronize a presentation clock with the main presentation clock and pre-rolling, the pre-rolling comprising starting the presentation clock,” as presently recited in claim 10. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, independent claim 10 is allowable.

Dependent claims 11-19 depend from independent claim 10 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite.

Independent claim 20, was rejected for similar reasons as independent claim 1, and is allowable for reasons similar to those given above. Richter, Potterveld, and Debique, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or suggest “access[ing] a time source as a main presentation clock to which all clock-aware components synchronize” and “pre-roll[ing] by starting a presentation clock synchronized with the main presentation clock after receiving data at the first media sink node,” as presently recited in claim 20. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, independent claim 20 is allowable.

Dependent claims 21-28 depend from independent claim 20 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,725,279 (Richter) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,878,431 (Potterveld). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 29, as presently presented recites, among other things, “means for synchronizing all clock-aware nodes to a main presentation clock which uses a highest priority time source” and “means for seamless presentation of media using the fully resolved media topology by receiving data from the first media source node before starting a presentation clock synchronized with the main presentation clock.”

Richter is directed to a multimedia processing system and discloses multimedia processing blocks. However, Richter fails to disclose or suggest “means for synchronizing all clock-aware nodes to a main presentation clock which uses a highest

priority time source” and “means for seamless presentation of media using the fully resolved media topology by receiving data from the first media source node before starting a presentation clock synchronized with the main presentation clock,” as presently recited in independent claim 29.

Potterveld is directed to a method for providing topology based enterprise management services and was cited for its alleged teaching of “retrieving a cached media pipeline topology” (Office Action, page 8). However, Potterveld fails to remedy the deficiencies in Richter noted above with respect to claim 29. For example, Potterveld fails to disclose or suggest “means for synchronizing all clock-aware nodes to a main presentation clock which uses a highest priority time source” and “means for seamless presentation of media using the fully resolved media topology by receiving data from the first media source node before starting a presentation clock synchronized with the main presentation clock,” as presently recited in claim 29.

Thus, Richter and Potterveld, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or suggest the features of claim 29. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, independent claim 29 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-6 and 8-29 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case,
Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Dominic S. Lindauer/_____
Dominic S. Lindauer (dominic@leehayes.com)
Registration No. 61417
David Divine (daved@leehayes.com)
Registration No. 51275
Customer No. 22801

Dated: __3/2/09____

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com